

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/501,169	02/09/2000	William T. Carden Jr.	35672-164254	3485
26694 VENABLE LL	7590 02/08/2007 .P		EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 343	85	HILLERY, NATHAN		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20043-9998		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/501,169	CARDEN JR., WILLIAM T.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Nathan Hillery	2176	

	Nathan Hillery	2176					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 18 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.					
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
	a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL							
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b					
3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) ☑ They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided by a status of the claims (a) is (as will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>26,28-37,39,41,42,44,46-55,57,59,60,7</u>	9-84,88,89,91-94 and 97.						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>62,64-73,75,77,78,85-87,90,95 and 96</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affiday	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> rit or other evidence is	t be entered s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12.   Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13. ☐ Other:	c	Heather R. Hern Supervisory Patent E	don Examiner				
	3	Technology Cente	r 2100				

## Application No. 09/501,169

### Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

#### Continuation of 3. NOTE:

The amendments seek to overcome the prior art of record and significantly change the scope of the claimed invention. Also, the non-allowed claims must be evaluated under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs before they can be deemed allowable.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that the claims are allowable because of proposed amendments presented in an interview on 8/17/06.

#### The Office disagrees.

There was no agreement reached in this case regarding proper amendments to overcome all potential rejections and thus make the application allowable at any time during this case's prosecution including the interview held with applicant's representative on 8/17/06. In contradistinction, applicant's representative simply informed the office that he would contact ASAP with a proposal and never returned the call. Further, the amendments would require further search and/or consideration.